

Application No.: 10/632643
Docket No.: CL2037USCIP

Page 11

REMARKS

This Response and Amendment replaces the Response filed on June 30, 2006, which was said by the Examiner to be non-compliant because "claims 1-10 are not represented". Claims 1-10 and claims 57-60 are cancelled due to their having been withdrawn from consideration. The present Amendment so indicates. Applicant submits that the present Amendment is in compliance.

Claims 12-15 are being amended to correct a minor error, by replacing "one or more compounds are" with "compound is". This amendment introduces no new matter, and is being made so that the dependent claims derive proper antecedent basis from claim 11.

Claims 35, 36, 51 and 52 were objected to because of multiple dependency. Claims 35, 36, 51 and 52 are being amended to remove the multiple dependency and Applicant submits that they are now in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 11-17, 19-21, 23-30, 32-34, 37-43, 45-47, 49-50 and 53-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Wheland et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,824,930 ("Wheland"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully points out to the Examiner that the compositions disclosed in Wheland are polymers. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to In contrast, the compositions used in the presently claimed processes are not polymers but rather are non-polymeric species including: cyclic, linear, or branched hydrofluorocarbons having 2 to 10 carbon atoms. Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the compositions disclosed in Wheland meet all of the limitations recited in the present claims. Furthermore, none of the compositions claimed in the instant application are polymers. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to the definition of the term "polymer" from Grant and Hackh's Chemical Dictionary, fifth edition, a copy of which is enclosed herewith. According to Grant and Hackh a polymer is "A substance composed of very large molecules consisting essentially of recurring long chain structural units that distinguish polymers from other types of organic molecules, and confer on them tensile strength, deformability, elasticity, and hardness." Applicant further directs the Examiner's attention to the enclosed copy of the definition of the term "polymer" from Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary, fourteenth edition. According to Hawley a polymer is "A macromolecule formed by the *chemical union of five or more identical* combining units called monomers."(emphasis added). Thus according to Hawley a polymer must be produced by polymerization of at least five or more identical units. Applicant

Application No.: 10/632643
Docket No.: CL2037USCIP

Page 12

respectfully submits that none of the compounds claimed in the instant invention were formed by the polymerization of five or more identical monomers. Furthermore, were one to possibly identify a repeat unit in one or another of the instantly claimed compounds, any 5-mer or greater of that repeat unit would have too many carbons to meet the limitations recited in the instant claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to the presently claimed invention by Wheland, which is clearly directed to polymeric compounds.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present claims are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Wheland.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

As an initial matter with regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicant points out to the Examiner that Wheland and the present application were under common ownership (assigned to E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company) at the time the present invention was made. Accordingly, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), Wheland cannot properly be used as prior art to reject the present claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the rejection of the present claims over either Deviny, U.S. Patent No. 4,975,300 in combination with Wheland or Hatzakis et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,678,850 is not proper. Nevertheless, in the interests of completeness and advancement of prosecution of the present application, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are addressed hereinbelow.

Claims 18, 31 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wheland in view of Deviny, U.S. Patent No. 4,975,300 ("Deviny"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that although Wheland does not disclose perfluoro-N-methylmorpholine, Deviny discloses a photoactive perfluorochemical liquid that is perfluoro-4-methylmorpholine, and that it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to employ perfluoro-N-methylmorpholine in the processes disclosed by Wheland because, the Examiner alleges, Deviny discloses that perfluoro-N-methylmorpholine, is "cost effective as an immersion fluid composition". Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the disclosure of Deviny at column 8, lines 1-4. Deviny is directed to a method for curing an organic coating and discloses compositions used in the method. At column 7, lines 65-68, Deviny explains that coatings were heated by immersion in saturated vapor. The text cited by the Examiner, from an example of the simultaneous use of condensation heating and UV to cure a diacrylate resin, merely states that "immersion in the perfluorinated vapor continued during UV exposure". Applicant points out that the "immersion" referred to in Applicant's specification is not used for heating, but is related to processes such as immersion lithography. As stated in Applicant's specification, on page 3, lines 12-14,

Application No.: 10/632643
Docket No.: CL2037USCIP

Page 13

in "immersion lithography, the optical source, the target surface, or the entire lithographic apparatus is immersed in a highly transparent high refractive index liquid." Applicant submits that even if the teachings of Deviny were combined with those of Wheland, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led by such combination to the presently claimed invention, because Wheland discloses the use of certain fluorinated compounds as monomers for use in making the polymers of Wheland. The present claims are not directed to polymers.

Claims 22 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wheland in view of Hatzakis et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,678,850 ("Hatzakis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the "difference between the claims and Wheland is that Wheland does not disclose that the compound is subjected to freeze-thaw fractional distillation". However, as discussed above, Applicant submits that there are other differences between the present claims and the disclosure of Wheland- in particular, that Wheland is directed to polymers and the present claims are not. Hatzakis is also directed to polymers, namely poly(halogenated) styrene, for use as resist materials. Thus, Applicant submits that even if a person of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the teachings of Wheland with those of Hatzakis, such combination would not anticipate or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Application No.: 10/632643
Docket No.: CL2037USCIP

Page 14

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



GAIL A DALICKAS
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Registration No.: 40,979
Telephone: (302) 992-4947
Facsimile: (302) 992-5374

Dated: August 09, 2006